Finland and the Dominican Republic, P. 3

Sweden and Six Pro-West Neutrals Propose Universal Rapacki Plan at UN, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 45 DECEMBER 4, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Adenauer's Old Game and Some Lessons of the Past

Two historic parallels may provide useful guidelines on the way to new Berlin negotiations. The first is the course of events under the Eisenhower Administration, between November 1958 when Khrushchev demanded a new status for West Berlin and May, 1960, when Eisenhower's assumption of personal responsibility for the U-2 blew up the summit conference. The second is the way the seizure of power by Hitler ended the long and tangled disarmament talks between World Wars I and II.

The main lesson of the first is to be wary of taking signs of "thaw" between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. as assurance of a peaceful settlement on Berlin so long as Adenauer and de Gaulle have a virtual veto power over negotiating terms and are allowed to delay talks interminably. Friendly exchanges between Washington and Moscow like the publication in *Izvestia* of the President's refreshing interview with its editor help to break the ice but they are falsely reassuring if not accompanied by resistance to German pressure and fuller education of the U.S. public to the basic issues. The course of events under Eisenhower was in some ways similar to the course of events under Kennedy. In both cases, on the plane of public relations there were gestures and exchanges which gave hope of a settlement while on the plane of diplomatic preparations Adenauer was successful in so limiting the area of negotiations as to make a settlement unlikely.

Even Dulles Not Rigid Enough For Adenauer

It is useful to recall that even John Foster Dulles was not rigid enough for Konrad Adenauer. When Dulles suggested in November, 1958, as a compromise that maybe East German instead of Russian officials might be allowed to stamp travel passes as "agents" of the Soviet Union, Adenauer (and Willy Brandt, too) were furious. There were similar convulsions in Bonn when in January, 1959, Dulles said that there might be other ways of unifying Germany than by free elections, the first public hint of proposals that West Germany should seek closer relations with East Germany as a means slowly of reuniting the country. Adenauer lives, as André Fontaine said in *Le Monde* (Nov. 22), in terror of being abandoned. He has constantly to be reassured by private letter from the White House when he sees the forbidden word "disengagement" in the press or hears that Secretary Rusk in talking with Foreign Minister Gromyko had mentioned that subversive phrase, "European security." Any formula which promises a framework in which diverse security needs might be reconciled—and thus the way really cleared for eventual German unity—sends Adenauer up in alarm. He is like the neurotic woman who rules her household by hysterics, threatening several times a month to commit suicide—as Adenauer regularly hints that, if thwarted, Catholic capitalist West Germany may join up with Moscow.

When Mr. Kennedy, trying hard to develop a more mature public opinion, spoke at Seattle recently of those who see "only two choices: appeasement or war, suicide or surrender, humiliation or holocaust", he was, even if unintentionally, describing our frenetic West German ally. During the recent German election campaign, both Adenauer's Christian Democrats and Brandt's Social Democrats were passionately in agreement that negotiations must not be limited to Berlin, that Berlin's interests could be safeguarded only in the context of wider negotiations. Now they have come whirling about full circle to the view that negotiations must be confined to Berlin alone. Adenauer feared that wider talks on European security might create another obstacle to German possession of nuclear warheads, that provisions against surprise attack might put Russian inspectors on West Berlin soil. In short, he feared a wider settlement might put a stop to West Germany's steady expansion in military power. It

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Not Exactly Truthful

Q. Minister, this is a question which has been kicking around here. I am sure you can put an end to it right at this moment. Please explain your reported Nazi background.

A. My only reply to this question is as follows, and this is a statement which I have already made in the past before the Bundestag, the German Parliament: I have never in my life been what is called here a Nazi, not even for one second. I have neither been a Nazi prior to 1933, nor have I been a Nazi after 1933, nor do I have any intention of being turned into a Nazi at this time through misrepresentation.

—German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder before the National Press Club, Nov. 22.

The statement issued by the German government on his past (as printed in *Die Zeit* of Hamburg Nov. 24) presents the facts differently. It denies that he was ever a Storm Trooper, but admits that he was a Nazi. The official biography says he applied for membership in the Storm Troopers in the winter of 1933-34 but his application lapsed when he moved from Bonn to Berlin. He did however join the Nazi party in 1933 and remained in it until 1941 when he married the daughter of a "non-Aryan" banker. (The ratio of money to actual Jewish blood had to be very wide for survival in such cases.) The biography claims that he showed his negative attitude toward Nazism by joining the Confessional Church in 1938. Nevertheless he remained in the Nazi party for three more years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Way Suggested for Neutrals to Take Nuclear Initiative from Deadlocked Big Powers

Sweden and Six Pro-West Neutrals Propose Universal Rapacki Plan

"The Rapacki Plan envisages the creation of one particular atom-free zone, that is, in Central Europe. In our proposal we should like to apply the principles underlying the Rapacki Plan on a universal basis. Why should not Africa or a part of the African continent become an atom-free zone if the African States so wish? . . . It could be raised with regard to other areas of the world than Africa. We realize that there might be different degrees as to which one area or the other could be sealed off from nuclear weapons.

"It may well be desirable, therefore, to lay down different rules for atom-free zones in different parts of the world. A rule that might be appropriate for conditions in Africa would, perhaps, not be equally fit or applicable in Central Europe. It is obvious that an over-all ban on nuclear weapons tests, as well as the establishment of atom-free zones, would call for certain controls. The problem of controls in connection with disarmament is very complicated and important. In our view it cannot be solved by one single formula; the solution must, instead, be adapted to the object of the controls in each particular instance. . . .

Need for Test Control Exaggerated

"Let me again express my feeling that the demand for controls, as a condition for a treaty prohibiting nuclear tests, has been given excessive importance in the face of the possibilities existing today of detecting nuclear explosions by means of technical devices. On the other hand, a certain amount of controls is needed, no doubt. I might add that this was acknowledged also by the author of the Rapacki Plan, which provides for a control system. . . .

"In a statement to this Committee on 26 October I suggested that in view of the failure of the three great Powers to reach an agreement to ban nuclear weapons tests, another approach might be tried. I then put the question whether the initiative could not be taken by the non-nuclear countries themselves. If the report which the Disarmament Commission is to receive on 14 December indicates no hope that the Geneva negotiations will be resumed under present circumstances, we could instead take steps to find out if those many countries which have not participated in the Geneva Conference and are in favor of prohibiting nuclear weapons tests might be ready to assume a more active part in order to reach a solution; they might form a 'non-atom club,' . . . under which they might undertake not to manufacture, not to import or not to store nuclear weapons on their own territories on behalf of their own or any other country. . . . We are attempting to open new roads for further negotiations."

—Mr. Unden, Sweden, in the UN First Committee, Nov. 17.

New Non-Nuclear Club Proposal

The other nuclear resolutions passed by the United Nations at this session—against testing and against the use of atomic weapons—are little more than the expression of pious hopes the big Powers can ignore. But as we went to press a vote was nearing on a different kind of resolution which the smaller powers can implement among themselves. This was offered by Sweden, with the support of six other pro-Western neutrals: Austria, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Libya, Sudan and Tunisia. This combines two ideas, one put forward by the Polish Foreign Minister Rapacki for an atom free zone in Central Europe, the other by Lord Russell many months ago for a "non-nuclear club" of smaller Powers. The resolution would instruct the Secretary General to ask the non-nuclear powers if they would be willing to "enter into undertakings to refrain from manufacturing or otherwise acquiring such weapons and to refuse to receive in the future nuclear weapons on their territories on behalf of any other country" and submit the results to the Disarmament Commission not later than next April 1. Because so little attention has been paid this proposal in the press we reprint here part of a Swedish speech at the UN explaining it.

Ceylon Sees The Danger of World Rule By A Russo-American Condominium

"What we have is not the classic armaments race of the 20th Century, when the fate of one nation or an alliance of nations was at stake, when armaments may even have nurtured the economies of nations. In the nuclear race it is the human race that is at stake, and while a few nations may still benefit economically from the production of armaments, such armaments are a deterrent to the development of the economies of the new-born states. . . . The nuclear arsenals . . . are a deterrent not to war but to peace and to peaceful development.

"There have emerged far out in front in the armaments race only two Powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—and if this race continues unabated, we shall soon find that these two Powers will enjoy the military domination of the world. . . .

"Nor is it too far fetched to envisage an evolution from this rivalry to one of partnership—that is to say when these two Powers join in a cartel, when they discover some bright early morning that they have more in common than their differences. Such things have happened in history before, even in such recent history as the Second World War when the enemies of yesterday have become the allies of today. . . .

"I do not say that is what Moscow and Washington want. I do not for one moment suggest that this is what they would even approve. But nations achieve objectives not only in policy but also in drift, in the logic of evolution, in the sudden and unforeseen turn of events. . . .

"Theories that human beings can survive a nuclear war are being assiduously cultivated and are creating the illusion that survival is a distinct possibility. Mankind is thus being hynotized into a state of complacency, and there is no need to stress here how dangerous such an illusion can be. . . .

"We want a peace race, no different from any other race in which the participants are in a hurry to get somewhere —in this case, into a world without arms. . . . The people of Ceylon want to see a world without weapons, a world without war, a world under the growing power of the United Nations."

—Mr. Malalasekera of Ceylon in the UN's First Committee debate on disarmament, Nov. 22.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While Each Side Accuses the Other of Colonialism, Both Practice It

What Russia Did in Finland, We Are Doing in the Dominican Republic

A hated phrase in Latin America is "geographical determinism." It means that countries living close to the United States must watch their step, not go too far left, be "practical." But "geographical determinism" is not peculiar to Uncle Sam's backyard. Last week Finland got a taste of it. While Mr. Zorin was lecturing the U.S. in the Security Council on the dispatch of a fleet to the Dominican Republic—"according to the UN charter," he said, "no country is entitled to intervene in the domestic affairs of another"—the Finnish President was being summoned to Novosibirsk. The Russians had been threatening "joint military measures", a euphemism for the reappearance of Soviet troops on Finnish soil, but were placated by the withdrawal from the coming Presidential elections of an oppostion candidate Moscow does not like. Mr. Khrushchev's "vote" has reelected Finland's President Kekkonen.

A Return to Gunboat Diplomacy

Mr. Stevenson was indignant at the Security Council because Cuba had termed our sending of a small flotilla of naval vessels and Marines to the Dominican Republic a violation of the Charter. From Washington's point of view, it had acted quickly to prevent the Trujillo clan from taking over again. But however salutary the immediate effect, this *was* a return to gunboat diplomacy and will be seen in Latin America as a dangerous precedent. The Cuban delegate asked the Security Council "whether a great Power may exert friendly pressure to defend what it believes to be the best Government for a small country." This speaks for Latin America. It also speaks for Finland. The Russian excuse is fear of German expansion in the Baltic; ours of Soviet bases in the Caribbean.

Our quick action to prevent the Trujillos from reestablishing themselves would evoke a warmer response in Latin America were it not plain that we were also trying to install in their place as right wing a regime as we can get. Balaguer was Trujillo's man; his inaction allowed the Trujillos to make off with most of the Republic's cash. The Trujillos owned most of the island's business. We're afraid this might become public property in a semi-socialist State, dangerous for "free enterprisers" like Standard Oil and United Fruit. Latins also fear that the Dominican affair will provide a precedent for action next against Cuba.

Look Who We're Asking To Protect Liberty In Cuba

"Torture has become as common [under Frondizi] as it was under Peron. . . . In July of this year, a Congressional investigating committee, which had turned up evidence of widespread police torture practices . . . was dissolved after a group of policemen fired 200 shots against the Congress buildings. . . . Censorship has become rigid. . . . Newspapers and magazines are constantly confiscated; more than 30 have been permanently banned since Frondizi became President. But such Fascist groups as Tacuara, which is protected by some Army factions and the oligarchy, and which denounces U.S. democracy as a 'Judaeo-capitalist' state led by 'Communist' Kennedy, go unmolested . . . break into Jewish cultural meetings . . . publish anti-Semitic tracts . . . yet not one of their leaders is ever hauled off to jail . . . but to squash [a recent 3-day general strike], police jailed 600 labor leaders. . . ."

—Baltimore Sun, Nov. 25, special article from Buenos Aires, by John Gerassi.

NOTICE TO READERS

In our issue of Nov. 13 we reprinted some fresh proposals on Berlin made by Senator Mansfield in a little noticed speech. As an experiment, we suggested that readers who like it show their appreciation by writing the Senator. So often Senators who break ground in such stale areas of public policy are disheartened by the lack of response. The response has been extraordinary. As of Nov. 29, we had received 488 notices from readers telling us they had written. The Senator's office is so swamped that acknowledgements have been held up awaiting the Senator's return later this month from South America. We thank our readers for writing, and will try this again some time soon.—IFS

An Appeal for A Brave Negro Widow Challenging the Police Who Killed Her Husband

We'd like to call the attention of the editors of the Washington Post to a footnote on page 174 of the new Civil Rights Commission report on Justice. This footnote reveals that the present Chief of Police of Dawson City, Georgia, jailed a key witness in the fatal beating of James Brazier and held him without charges to keep him from testifying before a Federal grand jury investigating the affair in August, 1958. The Police Chief is identified in the report only as an officer "Y" who was promoted to Chief of Police after the Brazier killing. He is W. B. Cherry.

The Department of Justice set this grand jury into motion as a result of an expose published by the Washington Post in July of that year. The reporter was Robert E. Lee Baker. The grand jury refused to indict. The outcome might have been different had it heard the missing witness, a man named Marvin Goshay. In any case, if the Civil Rights Commission story is true, the Police Chief was guilty of obstructing justice. Since this was the Post's campaign, we appeal to it to demand action by the Justice Department.

The matter is given fresh urgency by a related event which also went unnoticed in the press. Three days after the Commission's report was released, the Supreme Court refused to review the case of Brazier v. Cherry. This involves a $180,000 suit brought by Brazier's widow against the Police Chief, Sheriff Z. T. Matthews of Terrill County, and three other police officers. The Federal District Court had dismissed Mrs. Brazier's suit. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed this ruling 2-to-1 and the Supreme Court, by refusing to review, cleared the way for trial.

Mrs. Brazier is a brave woman, and has already won something for her people. The Circuit Court ruling in her case was the first appellate decision to hold that a widow may sue under the Civil Rights Act. The account of the case in the Commission report shows the brutality that she is up against. The same footnote about the missing witness also discloses that he was found dead under mysterious circumstances after Mrs. Brazier filed her suit, a suit in which he would have testified. Her chances of winning might be helped if the Washington Post again put the spotlight on her case and prodded the Justice Department into renewed action. What is the good of these investigations if nobody does anything about their findings?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disarmament After World War I Would Have Prevented Hitler's Rise

(*Continued from Page One*)

appears that in return for Adenauer's agreement to let talks proceed, Kennedy had to drop all such broader subjects and promise to confine the talks to Berlin alone. Indeed it looks as if Adenauer consented to talks only on conditions that make it unlikely they will succeed. The Adenauer entourage, including his humorless new Foreign Minister, has even erected an edifice of legal-metaphysical rationalization on the typically Germanic view that Allied rights in Berlin stem from conquest and are therefore "inalienable" and superior to any negotiated agreement. But if the West has "inalienable" rights of conquest in Berlin, the Soviet Union has the same "inalienable" rights of conquest in East Germany and can stay on there forever. A windier bunch of patent medicine vendors never yet turned up in our capital.

The Same Old Comedy

Now Adenauer is going to intercede for us with de Gaulle to obtain final approval for negotiations. This little comedy was also played out under Eisenhower. Adenauer and de Gaulle between them delayed the summit twice, until it was finally held only in May 1960, when Eisenhower was already on his way out as President. De Gaulle is not interested in a German settlement. He is satisfied with a divided Germany and dreams of using the French alliance with a truncated West Germany as the core of a new Third Force which can mediate between the "Anglo-Saxons" and the Russians. Between de Gaulle and Adenauer, one may be sure the coming talks among the Western powers will be long drawn out and end in leaving as little room for negotiation as possible. *It must never be forgotten that their prime aim is maintenance of tension between East and West.* Relaxation would end Germany's hopes of emerging as a major nuclear military power.

It is here that the course of the disarmament negotiations between 1919 and 1932 become relevant. Had the disarmament pledges of the Versailles pact been kept, had universal disarmament been achieved, Germany's reviving military power could have been nipped in the bud and the emergence of Hitler Germany prevented. The one sure way to prevent the emergence of a new German threat is through universal and general disarmament. When Mr. Kennedy told the editor of *Izvestia* that "if Germany developed an atomic capability of its own, if it developed many missiles, or a strong national army that threatened war, then I would understand your concern, and I would share it," he was making an admission Bonn will find very distasteful. What if West Germany becomes strong enough to turn the NATO alliance into an instrument for its own aggrandizement? What if it uses the Western alliance to force revision of its Eastern frontiers on threat of thermonuclear war? What if a future West German government, once fully armed by our help, treats the NATO pact as another scrap of power and resumes an independent policy, taking over by force the warheads stored on her soil? Or makes her own? Or uses her thermonuclear power to make a deal with Russia at the expense of both Poland and the West, as she did once before? The only real security either side can have against resumption of the old German blackmail game is to come to terms now, to bring the arms race to an end, to begin to dismantle the terror weapons and to establish a world of law, in which an international inspectorate and an international police force can make sure that secret war preparations do not go forward in Germany or anywhere else. That is why we welcome the renewed talks on testing and disarmament, and see in them a way to bypass Berlin in the search for peace.

They Trade While We "Crisis"

Cologne, Nov. 24—In spite of rising political tension, German trade with the Soviet bloc grew considerably in the third quarter of 1961. Compared with the same period of the year before, imports from the Soviet bloc rose 9.6 percent to 520.2 million marks (about $130,000,000) and exports to the bloc rose 8.9 percent to 494.2 million marks (almost $125,000.00).

—Die Welt *(Hamburg) Nov. 25. Page one item under the heading, "Despite Berlin Crisis, Trade With The East Grows."*

We'll Send Free Sample Copies of This to Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed LONG Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

12/4/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED